

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO**

MARGARET WEIDOW GENTRY, et al.,  
Plaintiffs,

v.  
GLENN GARNAND, LARRY BLANK, et al.,  
Defendants,

---

CV No. 18-1207 KG/CG

GLENN GARNAND,  
Third-Party Plaintiff,

v.  
LARRY BLANK and BEVERLY BLANK,  
Third-Party Defendants,

---

STATE FARM AND CASUALTY CO.,  
Plaintiff-Intervenor

v.  
LARRY BLANK, GLEN GARNAND,  
MARGARET WEIDOW GENTRY, et al.,  
Intervenor-Defendants

---

LARRY BLANK and BEVERLY BLANK,  
Counterclaimants on Complaint in Intervention

v.  
STATE FARM FIRE AND CASUALTY COMPANY  
Defendant on Counterclaim

**PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION**

**THIS MATTER** is before the Court on Plaintiffs' *Motion for Enlargement of Time for Plaintiffs to File Amendments to Pleadings and Join Additional Parties* (the "Motion to Extend"), (Doc. 64), filed February 13, 2020, and *Defendants Larry and Beverly Blanks' Response to Plaintiffs' Motion for Enlargement of Time to File Amendments to Pleadings and Join Additional Parties* (the "Response to Motion to Extend"), (Doc. 69), filed February 27, 2020. On February 20, 2020, the Honorable Kenneth J. Gonzales referred this matter to the undersigned to issue findings of fact, conduct legal analysis,

and recommend an ultimate disposition. (Doc. 67).

In their Response to Motion to Extend, Defendants explain they “do not oppose the relief requested by Plaintiffs in their Motion.” (Doc. 69 at 2). Plaintiffs did not file a reply addressing Defendants’ purported consent to their Motion to Extend. Instead, Plaintiffs filed a renewed, or “amended” Motion to Extend. (Doc. 72 at 3). As a result, the Court construes Plaintiffs’ Amended Motion to Extend as superseding their original Motion to Extend. As such, the Court **RECOMMENDS** Plaintiffs’ *Motion for Enlargement of Time for Plaintiffs to File Amendments to Pleadings and Join Additional Parties*, (Doc. 64), be **DENIED AS MOOT**. The Court will address the merits of Plaintiffs’ Amended Motion to Extend, (Doc. 72), by separate Order.

**THE PARTIES ARE FURTHER NOTIFIED THAT WITHIN 14 DAYS OF SERVICE** of a copy of these Proposed Findings and Recommended Disposition they may file written objections with the Clerk of the District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). **A party must file any objections with the Clerk of the District Court within the fourteen-day period if that party wants to have appellate review of the proposed findings and recommended disposition. If no objections are filed, no appellate review will be allowed.**



THE HONORABLE CARMEN E. GARZA  
CHIEF UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE